

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/803,749	03/18/2004	Amjad Farooq	6661-00	6908
7590 06/14/2006			EXAMINER	
Colgate-Palmolive Company 909 River Road			HARDEE, JOHN R	
P.O. Box 1343			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Piscataway, NJ 08855-1343			1751	
\cdot		DATE MAILED: 06/14/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
•	Application No.				
Office Action Commons	10/803,749	FAROOQ ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	John R. Hardee	1751			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period v - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) This 3) Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro				
Disposition of Claims					
4) Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) 3,5,6,10 and 14 is/are 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1, 2, 4, 7-9 and 11-13 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or Application Papers 9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	e withdrawn from consideration.				
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access applicant may not request that any objection to the explacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction of the order at the content of the content and the correction is objected to by the Explanation is objected to be added to the explanation is objected to the explanation is objected to be added to the explanation is objected to the explanation is objected to be added to the explanation is objected	epted or b) objected to by the formula of the following on be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing (s) is object.	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). lected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 					
Attachment(s)	Λ∏ Inter-time 0	(DTO 412)			
1)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:				

Application/Control Number: 10/803,749

Art Unit: 1751

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Claims 3, 5, 6, 10 and 14 remain withdrawn from consideration as being drawn to inventions non-elected without traverse. The other claims were searched and examined only to the extent that they read on the elected invention, as that was found not to be allowable. The restriction requirement was made final in the previous office action.

Double Patenting

2. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

3. Claims 1, 2, 4, 7-9 and 11-13 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-12

Page 2

Art Unit: 1751

of copending Application No. 10/803,586. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the '586 claims essentially the same subject matter as the present claims, except that the oil of part (b) comprises a perfume. Accordingly, the claims of the '586 anticipate the present claims.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 4. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
- 5. Claims 1, 2, 4, 7-9 and 11-13 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Heibel et al., US 2003/0045447 in view of Caswell et al., US 2005/0240670 for the reasons of record in the previous office action.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed May 23, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that the reference is drawn to a microcapsule which encapsulates material, rather than one which releases the material by desorption. This is not persuasive because applicant has claimed a starch granule comprising starch, an oil and a cationic surfactant. The reference makes it obvious to make such a granule, regardless of how the oil is released.

Art Unit: 1751

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to the examiner, Dr. John R. Hardee, whose telephone number is (571) 272-1318. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 until 4:30. In the event that the examiner is not available, his supervisor, Mr. Douglas McGinty, may be reached at (571) 272-1029.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8100.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

Application/Control Number: 10/803,749 Page 5

Art Unit: 1751

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

John R. Hardee Primary Examiner

June 8, 2006